REMARKS

Claims 2-3, 7, 9-10, 15-18, 20, 22 and 24 are canceled. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-14, 19, 21, 23 and 25-29 are pending and at issue in this application, with claims 1, 14, and 19 being independent claims.

Claims 1, 14 and 19 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 14 and 19 may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraphs [0092]-[0099] and FIG. 3. Independent claim 14 is further amended to correct informalities and to correct antecedent basis. Claim 1 is further amended and claims 4-6, 8, 11-12, 21, 23, 25-26, and 28 are amended to clarify antecedent basis.

Claim 6 is amended, and support for the amendments to claim 6 may be found, for example, in original claim 10 and in paragraph [0036]. Claim 8 is amended to delete an inadvertently repeated word. Claim 23 is amended to depend from claim 1 instead of from canceled claim 22, and claims 8 and 26 are amended in the self-explanatory manner seen above to address informalities.

Claims 13, 21 and 23 are amended to reflect changes made to independent claim 1. Claim 27 is amended to reflect changes made to independent claim 14.

No new matter is added by these amendments.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 stands objected to because of alleged informalities. Claim 14 is amended in the self-explanatory manner seen above to address this objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 6 is amended in the self-explanatory manner above to address this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Each of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-14, 19, 21, 23 and 25-29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,165,226 to Thurner et al.

(hereinafter "Thurner"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that Thurner does not disclose each and every element recited by independent claim 1, as amended. For example, the Office Action and the Advisory Action alleged Turner's graphical design of objects in Turner, 3:43-47 to be the "plurality of graphical element objects" recited in claim 1, as amended. However, Turner fails to disclose that each of his graphical design of objects includes:

> a visualization defining a visual property of a graphical element corresponding to the each graphical element object when the each graphical element object is implemented in a run-time environment, and

> at least one element binding defining an element interface between the each graphical element object and the data source in the run-time environment.

Similarly, the Office Action alleged Turner's display areas of Turner, 2:53-56 to be the "two or more real-time displays" recited by independent claim 1, as amended. However, Turner fails to disclose that each of his display areas are "bound, using the resolution table and a respective display binding, to a respective graphical display object," where each respective graphical display object includes:

> an indication of one or more connecting graphical element objects, and

> one or more display bindings defining a display interface between the each graphical display object and the display view in the run-time environment.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Turner fails to disclose other elements recited by independent claim 1, as amended, such as:

> a resolution table including:

> an indication of connections between element bindings and data sources in the process control environment, and

> an indication of connections between display bindings and display views in the process control environment[;]

> each respective graphical display object corresponding to the each of the two or more real-time displays including an indication of a same graphical element object from the plurality of graphical element objects; and

a same graphical element corresponding to the same graphical element object, the same graphical element presented on each of the two or more real-time displays and bound, using the resolution table and a respective element binding, to a same data source in the run-time environment.

In particular, with respect to the latter element "a same graphical element corresponding to the same graphical element object, the same graphical element presented on each of the two or more real-time displays and bound, using the resolution table and a respective element binding, to a same data source in the run-time environment," throughout Thurner's disclosure, Thurner consistently describes a first object viewed on one pane and a *related* (but not the *same*) object (e.g., Office Action's citation to Thurner, 4:10-13) viewed on a different pane. For example, see Thurner, 4:1-3 ("... selection of an object in either pane results in a corresponding refocusing of the other pane on a related object"), Thurner, 5:6-9 ("... a semantic link can connect a function block (i.e. a part of a PLC program) with the document describing the function block"), and Thurner: 5:33-35 ("... selection of a New Plant in the Tree pane automatically causes the upper pane (U) to refocus on an electrical wiring diagram." Furthermore, Thurner fails to mention bindings at all, let alone his first object and related object being bound to a same data source. As such, Thurner does not disclose at least the element recited by independent claim 1: "a same graphical element corresponding to the same graphical element object, the same graphical element presented on each of the two or more real-time displays and bound, using the resolution table and a respective element binding, to a same data source in the run-time environment."

For at least the above reasons, Thurner does not teach or disclose each and every element of independent claim 1, as amended, and accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established for independent claim 1 by using Thurner. Independent claim 14 and 19 each recite elements similar to independent claim 1. Dependent claims incorporate by reference each and every element of their respective independent claims. For at least reasons similar to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of anticipation also has not and cannot be established for claims 4-6, 8, 11-14, 19, 21, 23 and 25-29 by using Thurner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-14, 19, 21, 23 and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectively submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons provided above. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 06005/41124. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing comments or any claim amendments deemed needed to result in allowance, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 31, 2011

By: _Lilian Y. Ficht_

Lilian Y. Ficht
Registration No.: 64,514
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Patent Agent for Applicants